

You want, gentlemen, above every thing else, a reform of Parliament. Well, you may have it, if you like. Lord John Russell promises you an extension of the franchise. (Cries of 'Oh!') 'We won't have his reform.' Gentlemen, a word for Lord John Russell. Thanks to the power of public opinion in this country, manifested in a thousand ways every morning through the diurnal press, the minister is just what the people choose to make him. Show me the minister who can, session after session, keep the Jews out of Parliament, for example; and I say the people have not yet spoken out in their strength and omnipotence in behalf of the Jew. Show me the man who can annul, from year to year, under various disputes, the doctrine of finality, and then I predict from him that the people are not behind him, pushing him along with uncontrollable power. If they will leave him alone in the hands of those uncircumcised Philistines who are in that House, they have all power over him. He must either depend upon the people at the doors, or truckle to the time-serving votes of those in that House. The character of Lord John Russell's reform bill nobody knows. It will very much depend upon the people themselves. For myself, I do not mean to let the next five or six months go unimproved, if I can help it. (Cheers.) Let me get my reckoning over in the Tower Hamlets (laughter); let me hear the verdict and know the worst, and then I will sow beside all waters until the month of February next. If I have been guilty of a lapse in account of my absence in the months that are past, will now turn to the Parliament of the whole people, and do those things what I never could do in the Parliament of the House of Commons.

That reform bill will be what the people of England shall choose to say it shall be. Ask enough; demand all that justice sanctions you in demanding; you can at take less. You never go to a man who owes you twenty shillings with a bill for fifteen; you demand the whole sum. If he cannot pay more than fifteen, you give him a receipt for the odd five. (Hear and laughter.) Be it so in the matter of reform. Do not draw the line close; do not make the circle so circumscribed.

Mr. THOMPSON, in returning thanks, spoke as follows:—Sir, I am bound to acknowledge, however feebly, the Resolution which has been so unanimously and cordially passed by this meeting. The first thing that every man is bound to seek is the truth. But it is no less his duty, when he has, or deems that he has, discerned it, to promulgate it. But when, in the faithful discharge of his duty, he meets with the approbation, support and confidence of his fellow-men, that is cheering to him; less as a mark of personal approval of himself, than as putting the stamp of public approbation upon the principles for which he lives, and which he deems it his duty to preach. I have been singularly fortunate in my public meetings with my fellow-countrymen at home, and with strangers and foreigners elsewhere. The public meeting that I may attend where my sentiments are outvoted and my principles discountenanced, will be th-

The Alliance, as an organization, has never succeeded in this country, and probably will not, for reasons which I mentioned to you in a letter, some two or three years since; and yet the *principles and spirit* of the meeting in the summer of 1846, have diffused themselves widely among the evangelical denominations of this country. The position and relations to the churches, in different parts of the land, enable me, I think, to say this with a good deal of confidence. There is decidedly less of the disputatious, sectarian spirit, and more harmony, kind feeling, brotherly love, and cordial co-operation among Christians of different names, than has ever before been known among us. At least, so it seems to general observers. I think not without good reason. The general organization and plan of the Alliance is attended with greater good effects in countries here than in England, France, or Switzerland, or any other European country, and yet, standing, as all our churches do, on the same platform of equal rights and privileges, there are fewer disturbing causes among them; and animosities, wherever

that they desire to encourage their brethren from the United States to make similar efforts to revive the organization of the Evangelical Alliance existing in England, in accordance with the resolution of the Conference, in the confidence that, by the divine blessing, the difficulties which have hitherto obstructed their progress will, in answer to prayer, and under the influence of their united wisdom and charity, gradually give way, until they are altogether removed.

The Rev. John Angell James moved, and the Rev. Dr. King seconded, the adoption of this report; whereupon a smart discussion ensued. Several speakers, among whom were Dr. Cox and the Rev. H. Hinton, protested against it as unsatisfactory. But, as the official very much wished no discussion just then, the dissentients were appeased by the report being 'received,' instead of 'adopted.'

The Rev. Mr. Jones (of Birmingham) thought the report was of such a character as not to admit of discussion, and urged its immediate adoption; but from the number of the dissentients, it was found

an American slaveholder's heart? Who ever before heard of such an article? If there be such a thing in existence, it must be one of the greatest curiosities—one of the most decided rarities in the whole universe. An *American slaveholder's heart!* We would gladly compass both sea and land to witness so great a curiosity. If Dr. Baird ever met with such a thing, it is he who did not bring it over with him to the Great Exhibition. He has not, he says, and he says, in all the vast and varied articles in that interesting collection would have attracted half so much attention as the heart of an American slaveholder.

It will have been observed from our paper of Saturday, that all those members of the Evangelical Alliance who spoke on the subject, vindicated the propriety of the course which the Alliance had adopted in excluding the upholders of American slavery from its comprehensive brotherhood. The matter was referred to a council which met on Saturday for the purpose of furthering the same result. The meeting was adjourned till to-morrow, when we cannot doubt that the members of the Alliance to every

God—a divine revelation? Is the Baptist to run away, because he hears the Infidel speak of the Bible of Nature as far more sure and reliable than any sacrament? Is the Catholic to lift his head, because the Quaker exalts the inward light above every outward standard of religious truth and duty? Is the Quaker to stand aloof, because the Presbyterian refers to the clerical order as divinely instituted? Is the Unitarian to desert, because he has heard the doctrine of the atonement, the trinity, or total depravity, assumed as true and vital, in the course of the Anti-Slavery discussions? If so, where is the possibility of general co-operation? If not, 'the head and front of my offending hath that extent—no more.' Why, then, am I singled out for censure or expostulation?

It is readily conceded,* me, that great care should be taken to keep in abeyance, as far as is consistent with the maintenance of religious neutrality,

Thus do I dispose of your first charge.

You next declare,—“He ridiculed the institution of Christian ministry,—and, if our memory be not grossly at fault, attacked the institution of a Christian Sabbath; and in doing this, he employed phrases which no Christian could hear without a shudder: My sir, there can be no mistake here,—your memory grievously at fault. I should add a stronger declaration, were it not that I believe your insinuation intentional: nevertheless, that injustice is none the less.”

* See last page for all that portion of my speech which was directed against the charge of infidelity.

THE CROWN AND ANCHOR which related to religious subjects.



For the Liberator.

'CHOOSE YE WHOM YE WILL SERVE.'

The hour has come when we must choose who we will serve:—
Conscience says plainly, in each heart, Choose ye the good and true!
While heaven-born pity gently pleads, and points with tearful eye,
To where our suffering sisters toil, beneath a Southern sky.

See helpless childhood, sorrowing, left in solitude to mourn—
See the fond mother, from her home, and from her loved ones torn;
And in that bloody, cruel mart, where men like beasts are sold,
Is maiden virtue's priceless worth bartered for dross of gold.

And if we calmly close our eyes, or coldly turn away,
How can we to the God of truth, of love and mercy, pray?
Will not our poor wronged brothers' woes reproach our faithless life?
May not the outraged husband ask, "Christian, where is my wife?"

How can we answer such appeal?—and shall we dare reply,
We know not of thy many wrongs, nor heard we thy heart's sigh?
Our priests and rulers say 'tis right that thou for us shouldst toil,
For how could Southern Chivalry its hands with labor soil?

The Saxon blood flows in their veins—thou art dark Africa's son;
They from a race of heroes sprung—thou wert ignobly born;

Their sires were Albion's proud sons, their homes were lordly halls,
Where the bright sunlight glowing fell on picture-covered walls.

Thy fathers lived in low thatched huts, where Gambrill's waters flow;
Their proudest pastime was the hunt with lance or barbed bow;

Art never opened wide for them her stores of magic power;
Nor did fair Science e'er impart her gifts—a priceless dower.

May not the wronged ones thus reply?—If unto you were given
Knowledge and light to bless our race, why have ye never striven?

Why have ye with such jealous care kept us from Learning's fount?
Why are our spirit-pinnions bound, that we may never mount?

Into that higher, purer sphere, where Intellect holds sway,
Where the immortal mind finds food, treasures that ne'er decay?

Why do ye keep from us that Book which teaches how to live?
Did not the Savior unto all his blessed gospel give?

Ye send him word to hearken lands, beyond the Atlantic wave;
Our brethren on a distant shore ye strive to bless and save;

They hear the "Law of Love" proclaimed, who live by Congo's tide,
'Tis taught beneath the palm-tree's shade, and on the mountain side.

But who live within your homes, and toil that you may rest,
Are ye with its teaching kind, and gentle precepts blest?

Think ye that like the brutes we die, because with them we're sold,
And that our God-given souls ye buy, for silver or for gold?

No! Heaven be praised!—you have no power that endeth not with death;
Nor can your laws an hour prolong the dying bondman's breath;

Through the dark portals of the tomb he'll reach the promised land,
And Canaan's Lord will make him free, and stay the oppressor's hand.

Barre, Mass. CARRIE.

For the Liberator.

DUTY.

Consequences are the Lord's,
And the Duty only ours:
How the doctrine sternly taught
Affrights the allied powers!

At its coming earth was startled,
Clouds and darkness saw and fled,
Tyrants trembled—Death and Hell
Groined to yield their dead.

Then Expediency's lamp,
With its pale and flickering rays,
Waned and died; and o'er the gloom
Burned God's noonday blaze!

It leads, like Israel's shaft of flame,
Our footsteps through the midnight still;
At the pale dawn the pillared cloud
Waits on the distant hill.

Hark! from the ages dim and gone,
Solemn prophetic-voices say,
"Leave results to God—and do
Each duty well to-day."

Then pass Faith's watchword through the camp,
While pale Oppression shrieks and covers;
"CONSEQUENCES ARE THE LORD'S,
And the Duty only ours!"

HALT NOT ON YOUR WAY.
BY JOEL BARNES.

Ho! ye who start a noble scheme,
For general good designed,
Ye workers in a cause that tends
To benefit your kind!

Mark out the path ye fain would tread,
The game ye mean to play;
And if it be an honest one,
Keep steadfast in the way!

Although ye may not gain at once
The points ye most desire,
Be patient—time can wonders work—
Plod on, and do not tire;

Obstructions, too, may crowd your path,
In threatening, stern array,
Yet flinch not! they may only prove
Mere shadows in your way.

Then while there's work for you to do,
Stand not despairing by,
Let "forward" be the move ye make,
And "onward" be the cry;
And when success has crowned your plans,
"Twill all your pains repay;
To see the good your labor's done—
Then drop not on your way.

"He who hath, and will not give
The light of life to all that live,
Himself shall lose the way."

Selections.

From the London Morning Advertiser of August 20.

REPLY OF MR. GARRISON.

We reproduce from the American Boston Liberator, an article in answer to one which appeared some seven or eight weeks ago in this paper, on the subject of American slavery. In that article, referred to at some length by the most enterprising editor on which Wm. Lloyd Garrison, the leader of the abolitionist party, has labored for twenty years, on behalf of the 3,000,000 slaves in the Southern States,—to his great and manifold self-sacrifices in the Anti-Slavery cause,—and to the heroism, worthy the days of ancient Greece and Rome, which he has often shown in the hour of imminent personal danger.

But while thus expressing ourselves in reference to the conduct of Mr. Garrison, as the great champion of the Anti-Slavery cause in America, we took occasion to express our regret that he sometimes went out of his way, when on the Anti-Slavery platform, to introduce a personal and party speaking, to enunciate theological views at variance with divine revelation. We alluded to the subject solely for the purpose of dissuading Mr. Garrison from persisting in that course, because we know that many of the warmest friends which the anti-slavery cause has, either here or in the United States, are to be found among those who regard the Scriptures as an inspired book, and that infidel arguments were introduced into the Anti-Slavery platform, the result would be that many of the most earnest and sincere friends of the slave would withdraw themselves from the Anti-Slavery cause.

It is to this part of our article that the Liberator principally replies. All that Mr. Garrison, therefore, says on that point, we have transferred into our paper. The only portion, indeed, of the article which we have suppressed, is that which relates to Mr. John Scoble, the Secretary of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. We have omitted this portion of Mr. Garrison's article, because Mr. Scoble has lately visited this country on a temporary visit to Canada; for, however hard we may ourselves have been of late, and he, we know, thinks we have been a great deal too hard,—we should consider it ungenerous to attack him while he is not in this country to defend himself. For that reason we have omitted, at least for the present, what Mr. Garrison has said of the Secretary of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.

We now come to the point at issue between the Liberator and the American Abolitionists, and conclude that point fairly. Not that that gentleman would purposely or consciously give a wrong representation of the nature of the differences between us. He is a man much too just, too generous, too great a lover of truth, for that. Still, the fact is as we have stated. The matters at issue between him and us are not laid before America, public in strict accordance with the facts of the case.

The whole of that part of Mr. Garrison's article which refers to this point has a direct tendency to convey the idea, that our ground of controversy with him is the fact affirmed by us—of his holding opinions at variance with divine revelation. Now, so far from having any quarrel with Mr. Garrison on this account, we distinctly stated, in the very article to which he replies, that we quarrel with no man on this account; that, on the contrary, we accord to every man the perfect right to embrace and to advocate any opinions which he pleases. Mr. Garrison, or any one else, has just as good a right to reject revelation, as we have to receive it. And though we may deplore what we would, in the supposed case, regard as an error of judgment on his side, we should never, for a moment, on that account, have any quarrel with him.

Our sole ground of controversy with the leader of the American Abolitionists is, that he should introduce his peculiar views on theological points on the Anti-Slavery platform, and thereby estrange from the Anti-Slavery cause many persons whose friendship for the slave is unbounded. But Mr. Garrison denies the justice of the charge. He says, in answer to it—"It is not true that I have, on many occasions, or on any occasion, gratuitously obtruded my peculiar views on religious subjects, on the Anti-Slavery platform, in any discussion on the question of slavery."

Now, here our statement and Mr. Garrison's assertion are at variance. Either of us must be wrong. Which of us is in error? The American and the English public have a right to call for evidence, either in support or disproof of the charge. As we preferred the charge, we admit that we are bound to produce our proofs. As Mr. Garrison denies that we ever introduced, on the Anti-Slavery platform, on any occasion, his peculiar theological views, which we are to understand, viewed at variance with divine revelation—we feel that we shall have made out our case, if we substantiate one instance in which he did so.

We beg, then, to refer Mr. Garrison to a speech which he delivered five years ago, when in England, in the Crown and Anchor Tavern, at a meeting of an exclusively anti-slavery character. On that occasion, Mr. Garrison did, as we have stated, obtrude his peculiar theological views, by common consent, to be an essential part of Christianity. He ridiculed the institution of a Christian ministry, and, if our memory be not grievously at fault, he even introduced, on the Anti-Slavery platform, on that occasion, his peculiar theological views, which we are to understand, viewed at variance with divine revelation—we feel that we shall have made out our case, if we substantiate one instance in which he did so.

Now, here our statement and Mr. Garrison's assertion are at variance. Either of us must be wrong. Which of us is in error? The American and the English public have a right to call for evidence, either in support or disproof of the charge. As we preferred the charge, we admit that we are bound to produce our proofs. As Mr. Garrison denies that we ever introduced, on the Anti-Slavery platform, on any occasion, his peculiar theological views, which we are to understand, viewed at variance with divine revelation—we feel that we shall have made out our case, if we substantiate one instance in which he did so.

Now, here our statement and Mr. Garrison's assertion are at variance. Either of us must be wrong. Which of us is in error? The American and the English public have a right to call for evidence, either in support or disproof of the charge. As we preferred the charge, we admit that we are bound to produce our proofs. As Mr. Garrison denies that we ever introduced, on the Anti-Slavery platform, on any occasion, his peculiar theological views, which we are to understand, viewed at variance with divine revelation—we feel that we shall have made out our case, if we substantiate one instance in which he did so.

Now, here our statement and Mr. Garrison's assertion are at variance. Either of us must be wrong. Which of us is in error? The American and the English public have a right to call for evidence, either in support or disproof of the charge. As we preferred the charge, we admit that we are bound to produce our proofs. As Mr. Garrison denies that we ever introduced, on the Anti-Slavery platform, on any occasion, his peculiar theological views, which we are to understand, viewed at variance with divine revelation—we feel that we shall have made out our case, if we substantiate one instance in which he did so.

Now, here our statement and Mr. Garrison's assertion are at variance. Either of us must be wrong. Which of us is in error? The American and the English public have a right to call for evidence, either in support or disproof of the charge. As we preferred the charge, we admit that we are bound to produce our proofs. As Mr. Garrison denies that we ever introduced, on the Anti-Slavery platform, on any occasion, his peculiar theological views, which we are to understand, viewed at variance with divine revelation—we feel that we shall have made out our case, if we substantiate one instance in which he did so.

Now, here our statement and Mr. Garrison's assertion are at variance. Either of us must be wrong. Which of us is in error? The American and the English public have a right to call for evidence, either in support or disproof of the charge. As we preferred the charge, we admit that we are bound to produce our proofs. As Mr. Garrison denies that we ever introduced, on the Anti-Slavery platform, on any occasion, his peculiar theological views, which we are to understand, viewed at variance with divine revelation—we feel that we shall have made out our case, if we substantiate one instance in which he did so.

Now, here our statement and Mr. Garrison's assertion are at variance. Either of us must be wrong. Which of us is in error? The American and the English public have a right to call for evidence, either in support or disproof of the charge. As we preferred the charge, we admit that we are bound to produce our proofs. As Mr. Garrison denies that we ever introduced, on the Anti-Slavery platform, on any occasion, his peculiar theological views, which we are to understand, viewed at variance with divine revelation—we feel that we shall have made out our case, if we substantiate one instance in which he did so.

Now, here our statement and Mr. Garrison's assertion are at variance. Either of us must be wrong. Which of us is in error? The American and the English public have a right to call for evidence, either in support or disproof of the charge. As we preferred the charge, we admit that we are bound to produce our proofs. As Mr. Garrison denies that we ever introduced, on the Anti-Slavery platform, on any occasion, his peculiar theological views, which we are to understand, viewed at variance with divine revelation—we feel that we shall have made out our case, if we substantiate one instance in which he did so.

Now, here our statement and Mr. Garrison's assertion are at variance. Either of us must be wrong. Which of us is in error? The American and the English public have a right to call for evidence, either in support or disproof of the charge. As we preferred the charge, we admit that we are bound to produce our proofs. As Mr. Garrison denies that we ever introduced, on the Anti-Slavery platform, on any occasion, his peculiar theological views, which we are to understand, viewed at variance with divine revelation—we feel that we shall have made out our case, if we substantiate one instance in which he did so.

the character of an inspired book, does not therefore know what is to be made of the book, and that it is unwise to attach such vital importance to that which really determines nothing?

But we have what we regard as still better proof, that Mr. Garrison is not a believer in divine revelation. Actions and words are evidence. Regarding the latter, we may make a mistake; regarding the former, there is little or no such danger. Mr. Garrison attends no place of Christian worship; and this, we hold, unless there be some very peculiar circumstances in the case, to be presumptive proof that he does not recognize the authority of the Scriptures. We have said, and shown, that, in addition to his not attending any place of Christian worship, he disregards those institutions—and especially the institution of a Christian ministry—which Christians of all denominations consider, by common consent, to be indispensable portions of the religion of Jesus.

But we will not pursue the matter farther. Nothing but the consideration to which we have before adverted, could have induced us to enter upon it. What we ask Mr. Garrison to do, we endeavor to practice ourselves. When we abjure him not, in his capacity of the friend of the slave and the advocate of abolition, on any occasion, or under any circumstances, to assail divine revelation, either directly or by implication, we pledge ourselves that we will, for the sake of the cause of 3,000,000 of human beings, attack the theological views of those whose notions are at variance with ours. With him, and others like-minded, we can act with perfect cordiality. As the advocates of the entire and immediate emancipation of the slaves in the United States, we can forget, for the moment, that we have any other opinions at all. In the cause of the slave, we divine—our only happiness here and hereafter—of millions of human beings is so deeply involved, we are prepared to merge all other considerations, and feel, for the time, as if we had no other mission on earth to fulfill. Let all the friends of the slave feel in the same way, and we shall bring to bear on the strongholds of Transatlantic slavery, such a combination of moral resources as will soon lay the hateful edifice in a heap of ruins.

From the London Morning Advertiser of August 22.

We publish in another column a letter from Mr. Smith, of Dalton, in vindication of the character of Mr. Garrison, the leader of the abolitionists in America. We do not see that the tenor of our article of Wednesday, to which our correspondent replies, is materially affected. At a distance of five years, persons must have better memories than it is our fortune to possess, to have a distinct impression of the details of a speech then delivered,—but our impression is as vivid of the injudicious character of Mr. Garrison's speech, as the testimony of those who were present. With regard, again, to one particular expression which we quoted as having been used by Mr. Garrison,—an expression, which, however qualified by whatever may have preceded or accompanied it, cannot fail to shock the feelings of Christian men,—with regard to the fact of such an expression having been made use of by Mr. Garrison, we are deeply anxious that those persons who were present, and who affirm that they remember it so distinctly, because it caused at the time so great a revulsion in their minds.

But we are willing to believe, that the injudicious manner in which Mr. Garrison pleaded the cause of the slave, on the occasion in question, was quite an exception to his usual advocacy of the cause. At any striking instance, we have a great character for candor, which he and we differ should not prevent our cordial co-operation in the effort to emancipate the 3,000,000 slaves in America, we shall let the matter rest, until we learn what Mr. Garrison himself may say on the subject, when our article has reached Boston.

To the Editor of the Morning Advertiser:

Sir—Your leading articles on the subject of American slavery having attracted considerable attention to that subject during the last few weeks, and because I feel that I have the only opportunity of fairly looking the system in the face, the public will, in all probability, take their American anti-slavery impressions from your columns. This I am perfectly willing they should do on every topic save one, and that I crave leave to enter my protest. The expected case is the character of William Lloyd Garrison.

[Mr. Smith proceeds to quote certain charges made against Mr. Garrison in the article we have copied from the Morning Advertiser of Aug. 20, and adds:] Now this last sentence, and a few words higher up, which refer to the possibility of memory being at fault, led me, on my return home last night, to turn up the speech in question, a verbatim copy of which appeared in two or three of the newspapers of that date, as far as I know, the only copy of the speech which I cannot find a trace in support of any one of your allegations. Will you do me the favor to take the same pains, and produce the passage or passages in question? Your candor convinces me that you can have no motive but to establish the truth, and right glad am I that this question has been brought fairly to an issue. We have in the case of Cromwell a document beside you, since you appear to give credit to the gross misrepresentation, and how successful personal malignity may prove. Let the triumphant vindication of that great man be a lesson to us to receive nothing as true, affecting the character of public men, which is not proved. The onus of proof in the case before us lies, you admit, with you; but possibly you may not have the necessary documents beside you, since you appear to give credit to impressions. Believing that you have not, or that you have preferred giving printed evidence, I beg to submit an extract or two from the speech in question, as good substantial evidence that Mr. Garrison never said what you allege that he did say; and, should these prove unsatisfactory, then I offer you the whole speech, and beg, as a means of justifying yourself, or of vindicating a great and good man from a foul and mischievous calumny, that you will publish it entire. The extracts I offer are the following:—

[For these and other extracts, see the report of the speech, in the next column, as published in the London Universe of Aug. 21, 1846.]—Ed. Lib.

Such are a few of the sentiments uttered by Mr. Garrison on the occasion referred to, and, to the reminder of the speech harmonizes with them. If you doubt it, publish it, and leave the public to judge. There is one sentence, however, in your leading article, which deserves a special notice. It is that which makes Mr. Garrison to say, that the Christian God was his devil. I can find nothing of the kind in the speech at the Crown and Anchor Tavern, and I am sure that Mr. Garrison never uttered such a statement, either there or anywhere else. I do, however, recollect a passage in one of Mr. Garrison's speeches during that autumn, (1846,) the substance of which I will supply, regretting only that after a good deal of pains, I cannot lay my finger on it in print. He described the condition of America as a system of robbery, concubinage, incest, lying and murder. He quoted overwhelming proof of the sanction of the American churches to this system, which maintained that it was supported by God, for it was supported by the Scriptures. Now, does not every honest Christian man's bosom swell with indignation at such an impudent and enormous lie, and would he think, at least, but Mr. Garrison had the audacity to say, "If this is your God, he is my devil." Now, if this be not a fair and truthful representation of the sentiments uttered, you will, I am sure, put it right. The same allegations were made against Mr. Garrison at the time, by a popular magazine of the day, and although there were many replies offered, and among them one from Mr. Garrison himself, that journal persisted in scrupulously excluding them, one and all, and continued to heap scandal upon scandal.

Possibly it may not be unimportant to know that my own religious views appear to square with your own, as giving a little more weight to my but too feeble testimony. But what Mr. Garrison is specifically from any speech, or from any of his own anti-slavery subjects, I really cannot tell. I am satisfied to find there the spirit of Christianity, which may be, and probably is, the reason why it is said of him, as it was of our Lord and Master, "He hath a devil; why hear ye him?"

I am convinced that these remarks without thinking you will not refuse testimony, however feeble, to the virtues of a man, who, to use your own words, has exhibited a heroism worthy of the days of ancient Greece and Rome, in the hour of imminent personal danger. I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

ROBERT SMITH.

South Dalton, Aug. 21, 1851.

From the London Universe of Aug. 21, 1846.

THE NEW ANTI-SLAVERY LEAGUE.

On Monday evening last, a meeting was held at the Crown and Anchor Tavern, Strand, by the Anti-Slavery League. The large room was crowded from an early hour of the evening by a highly respectable assembly, who nearly all remained to the close of the proceedings, which was not 12 o'clock. On the platform we observed Dr. Oxley, Rev. Dr. Carlisle, of Hackney, Rev. Mr. Newman, and other gentlemen from Belfast, Messrs. Garrison, Wright, Douglass, from America, and Messrs. G. Thompson, Vincent, Parry, and many other leading friends of the anti-slavery cause.

On the motion of Mr. Parry, seconded by Mr. Vincent, George Thompson, Esq., was called to the chair.

Mr. GARRISON then introduced to the meeting. He was received with enthusiastic cheering, hundreds rising from their seats. He wished to know if they were in earnest when they gave him that reception? Were they disposed to regard him as the friend of universal liberty? Then he begged to tell them, that if they went over to him, they would be deemed fit to be hanged for a lynch law. (Laughter.) What? Were they in earnest? Were there no apologists for slavery there? none to applaud those ancient slaveholding patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob? none to talk of sending Onesimus back to his master, because he was a slave? Were there none to apologize for those pious men who plundered cradles of babes, for the editor in Richmond, proceeding along the road to fulfil an appointment to preach, I was overtaken, when about a mile from Richmond, by four men, riding on horses. Under threats of instant assassination if I resisted, they compelled me to leave the road, and led me across fields and lanes, to a deep ravine in a bye place. Binding my arms behind me, they learned, by questioning me, that I believed it just to emancipate the slaves on the soil. They then blindfolded me, and employed some time in discussing whether they should hang, whip, tar and feather, or duck me. They decided on the latter treatment. Removing the bandage from my eyes, they led me to a pond, unbound my arms, and threatened that I could swim, and throw me with violence into the water. On my coming out, they threw me in twice more, and then required me to promise to leave the county, and never return. I refused. They threw me in again, and on coming out, I made the promise. They then required me to agree to leave Kentucky, and never return. On my refusing, they threw me in again, after which they tied me up to a tree to fog me, and blindfolded my eyes, but changing their minds, led me to the pond. I took off the bandage from my eyes, and threw me in five times more. Finding my strength failing me, with what of life remained I promised to leave Kentucky, and never return. They then required me to proceed out of the State, threatening me with death if I visited Mr. Clay's, or told of my treatment before leaving the State, or ever appeared again in Kentucky. Escaping with my life, I proceeded out of the State. Now, I would inquire, did not some rest on the pro-slavery ministers and churches in Kentucky, or the other States? Ought not the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society to have expressed its disapproval of such religionists? The omission to condemn their conduct at the late annual meeting is a terrible fact in anti-slavery history. Would not Thomas Clarkson have done so? Witness his letter to the pro-slavery ministers of the South, urging them either to quit the South, or preach against slavery. Had his mantle fallen on his successors, seven years would not have elapsed, developing events of so great historical importance to the anti-slavery reform, without a call for a World's Anti-Slavery Convention. It pains me to think that the mighty anti-slavery energies of the English nation, in some unexplained way, are held in check by the pro-slavery religious bodies of America.

I am permitted to add, that in the report of the Liberator, of a Source given to George Thompson, Esq., M.P., in Boston, by attributing to me the remarks made by another, I am represented as a Garrisonian. I belong to the Liberty party. I regard Mr. Garrison and the members of the American Anti-Slavery Society as having greatly injured the cause by diffusing anti-slavery light. When America cries "Shame on the slaveholder!" the system dies. And from the Liberator and the American Anti-Slavery Society the slaveholder expects to hear the reproach—"Shame! Shame!"

In closing, I would express my gratitude to the Liberator, for having exposed the case of the pro-slavery religionists of the South, urging them to abolitionists of every shade of opinion, who are working for abolition, without special favor to any Society in America.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

EDWARD MATTHEWS.

Oxford, August 14, 1851.

We bespeak the special attention of our readers to a communication which we elsewhere insert, on one of the many aspects which are worn by American slavery. Mr. Matthews, the writer, is a minister of the gospel, a man of great moral worth, and whose abhorrence of the monstrous enormity of American slavery is so great, that he would not, at any time, deem his life too great a sacrifice,—were he to sacrifice to pave the way for the extinction of this most gigantic of all the evils with which Providence, for purposes incomprehensible by us, permits His otherwise fair creation to be, for a season, cursed.

Mr. Matthews' narrative of his personal sufferings and sacrifices in the cause of slave emancipation is one of extraordinary interest. No one can read the reverend gentleman's statements without being under the influence of a powerful and salutary moral influence. He reflects that, for no other offence than his friendship for the oppressed slave, he received such brutal and inhuman treatment, from persons glorying in their civilization, and boasting that they are the citizens of a country whose Government is based on the principle, that all men are equal, and all men are brethren. Still more astounding in the recollection of the fact, that men not only calling themselves Christians, but filling the office of ministers of the gospel, should, if not actually inciting to those attempts which were made by an infuriated mob to murder our correspondent, accord to them their approval.

But the abhorrence of American slavery must not, in connection with Mr. Matthews' story, monopolize our indignation. There are parties nearer home, who have large claims on a much greater measure of our indignation than we would deem it prudent to express. The conduct of the Anti-Slavery Society in Broad Street, assuming, as we are bound to do, Mr. Matthews' statement to be correct, is, in the eyes of the pro-slavery party in the United States, a most heinous crime, even more reprehensible than that of the pro-slavery party in the United States, who, within an ace of robbing their hands in his blood, and bringing on their souls the guilt of his murder.

Mr. Matthews broadly and openly charges the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society with having denied him the opportunity of detailing his wrongs before an English audience, on the occasion of the recent anti-slavery meeting at Exeter Hall. He says, in the most explicit terms,—"I was refused as to leave no room for mistake or misconception in the matter—that he applied, time after time, to Mr. Scoble, by letter and otherwise, for permission to make a statement to that meeting of the sufferings he endured, and the perils to which he exposed his life, in his anxiety to promote the anti-slavery cause. Mr. Scoble resolutely refused to allow the reverend gentleman to unfold the tale of his sufferings, and to tell an English audience the sufferings he endured, the indignities heaped upon him, and the imminent danger to which his life was exposed. So, at least, Mr. Matthews assures us, and in the absence of any denial of his statement, we are bound to believe him. If his statement be not correct, it is for Mr. Scoble, whose name is so unreservedly mentioned, to show that it is ungrounded."

Our columns are at that gentleman's disposal to set himself right, if he can, with the public. It will not do, he may be assured, to affect to treat as a charge, specially and openly made, with indifference. It is right the Anti-Slavery Society should be told, that they have no such excess of character in the country as that they can afford to disregard charges of this nature. It would not, on the contrary, be easy to point to a case in modern history, in which a professedly benevolent body, containing on the list of its Committee the names of sundry individuals of established reputation, who possessed moral weight than the individuals who constituted the managing Committee of the Broad Street body. If Mr. Scoble, as a member of the Committee, thinks proper to avail himself of the columns, then we shall feel that we have a perfect right to assume that Mr. Matthews' statement is strictly correct, when he adverts to the urgency and frequency of his application,—made without effect

From the London Morning Advertiser of August 16.

AMERICAN SLAVERY—MR. SCOBLE.

To the Editor of the Morning Advertiser:

Sir—From reading several numbers of the Morning Advertiser, I have learned the deep interest which you feel in behalf of unprotected chattelized humanity, and your desire to array the religious and moral power of England against slavery's strongest bulwark—the pro-slavery ministers and churches in the United States of America.

Having attended the annual meeting of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, in Exeter Hall, on the 21st of June last; expecting, as one of the pro-slavery slave hunting lynch law, to be allowed to narrate my own experience, and endeavor to obtain an opportunity to speak by application to Mr. Scoble, Secretary of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society having failed,—I sit down to record briefly that experience, and place it at your disposal, believing that, under the circumstances, you will pardon me for troubling you with this communication.

By the Annual Report of the American Baptist Free Mission Society, which I herewith forward you, you will learn that this body appointed me a missionary to labor in the slave States. For two months I labored in Virginia, but left, because to deny the right of property in man is an offence punishable with twelve months' imprisonment and five hundred dollars fine.

As no such law existed in Kentucky, I commenced laboring in the border counties of Lewis and Bracken. I visited the interior of the State, hoping that as 600 votes had been polled for the emancipating candidate in Madison county, I might lecture there in security. I visited Cassius M. Clay, Esq., whose anti-slavery press at Lexington, some time since, was seized by a mob, boxed up, and sent into Ohio. We drew up a call for a convention of emancipators, anticipating that when it should assemble, means would be furnished to put an anti-slavery press in operation again. To this call I obtained some signatures, and applied to each church in Richmond, the county seat, for permission to lecture on the moral and religious condition of the slaves, but without success. On Sunday evening, February 16th, being invited, I preached to the colored people. At the close of the services, I was mobbed out of the village, because anti-slavery tracts were found in my possession: the mob, on leaving me, fired a pistol five or six times.

I again visited Mr. C. M. Clay, and wrote an article descriptive of my treatment for the Richmond Chronicle, which, together with a brief article by Mr. C. on the same transaction, I placed in the hands of the editor in Richmond. Proceeding along the road to fulfil an appointment to preach, I was overtaken, when about a mile from Richmond, by four men, riding on horses. Under threats of instant assassination if I resisted, they compelled me to leave the road, and led me across fields and lanes, to a deep ravine in a bye place. Binding my arms behind me, they learned, by questioning me, that I believed it just to emancipate the slaves on the soil. They then blindfolded me, and employed some time in discussing whether they should hang, whip, tar and feather, or duck me. They decided on the latter treatment. Removing the bandage from my eyes, they led me to a pond, unbound my arms, and threatened that I could swim, and throw me with violence into the water. On my coming out, they threw me in twice more, and then required me to promise to leave the county, and never return. I refused. They threw me in again, and on coming out, I made the promise. They then required me to agree to leave Kentucky, and never return. On my refusing, they threw me in again, after which they tied me up to a tree to fog me, and blindfolded my eyes, but changing their minds, led me to the pond. I took off the bandage from my eyes, and threw me in five times more. Finding my strength failing me, with what of life remained I promised to leave Kentucky, and never return. They then required me to proceed out of the State, threatening me with death if I visited Mr. Clay's, or told of my treatment before leaving the State, or ever appeared again in Kentucky. Escaping with my life, I proceeded out of the State.

Now, I would inquire, did not some rest on the pro-slavery ministers and churches in Kentucky, or the other States? Ought not the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society to have expressed its disapproval of such religionists? The omission to condemn their conduct at the late annual meeting is a terrible fact in anti-slavery history. Would not Thomas Clarkson have done so? Witness his letter to the pro-slavery ministers of the South, urging them either to quit the South, or preach against slavery. Had his mantle fallen on his successors, seven years would not have elapsed, developing events of so great historical importance to the anti-slavery reform, without a call for a World's Anti-Slavery Convention. It pains me to think that the mighty anti-slavery energies of the English nation, in some unexplained way, are held in check by the pro-slavery religious bodies of America.

I am permitted to add, that in the report of the Liberator, of a Source given to George Thompson, Esq., M.P., in Boston, by attributing to me the remarks made by another, I am represented as a Garrisonian. I belong to the Liberty party. I regard Mr. Garrison and the members of the American Anti-Slavery Society as having greatly injured the cause by diffusing anti-slavery light. When America cries "Shame on the slaveholder!" the system dies. And from the Liberator and the American Anti-Slavery Society the slaveholder expects to hear the reproach—"Shame! Shame!"

In closing, I would express my gratitude to the Liberator, for having exposed the case of the pro-slavery religionists of the South, urging them to abolitionists of every shade of opinion, who are working for abolition, without special favor to any Society in America.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

EDWARD MATTHEWS.

Oxford, August 14, 1851.

We bespeak the special attention of our readers to a communication which we elsewhere insert, on one of the